

ON THE APPROXIMATE ROOTS OF POLYNOMIALS

BY JANUSZ GWOŹDZIEWICZ AND ARKADIUSZ PŁOSKI

ABSTRACT. We give a simplified approach to the Abhyankar–Moh theory of approximate roots. Our considerations are based on properties of the intersection multiplicity of local curves.

1. THE MAIN RESULTS

For any power series $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ we define the intersection number $(f, g)_0$ by $(f, g)_0 = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]/(f, g)$. Suppose that $f = f(x, y)$ is an irreducible power series and let $n = (f, x)_0 = \text{ord } f(0, y) < +\infty$. Then there exists a power series $y(t) \in \mathbb{C}[[t]]$, $\text{ord } y(t) > 0$ such that $f(t^n, y(t)) = 0$. We have $(f, g)_0 = \text{ord } g(t^n, y(t))$ for any $g = g(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$. The mapping $g \mapsto (f, g)_0$ induces a valuation v_f of the ring $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]/(f)$. Let $\Gamma(f)$ be the semigroup of v_f i.e. $\Gamma(f) = \{ (f, g)_0 \in \mathbb{N} : g \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(f)} \}$.

According to the well known structure theorem for the semigroup $\Gamma(f)$ ([1], [2], [10] and Sect. 3 of this paper) there is a unique sequence of positive integers $b_0, b_1, \dots, b_h$ such that

- (i) $b_0 = (f, x)_0$,
- (ii) $b_k = \min(\Gamma(f) \setminus (\mathbb{N}b_0 + \dots + \mathbb{N}b_{k-1}))$ for $k = 1, \dots, h$.
- (iii) $\Gamma(f) = \mathbb{N}b_0 + \dots + \mathbb{N}b_h$ i.e. $\Gamma(f)$ is generated by $b_0, b_1, \dots, b_h$

If the conditions (i), (ii), (iii) are satisfied, we write $\Gamma(f) = \langle b_0, \dots, b_h \rangle$. Also define $B_k = \gcd(b_0, \dots, b_k)$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, h$ and $n_k = B_{k-1}/B_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, h$. We have

- (iv) $n_k > 1$ and the sequence $B_{k-1}\bar{b}_k$ is strictly increasing for $k \geq 1$.

Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an integral domain of characteristic zero. Let $g \in \mathcal{O}[y]$ be a monic polynomial and let d be a positive integer such that d divides $\deg g$. According to Abhyankar and Moh [2] the approximate d^{th} root of g denoted $\sqrt[d]{g}$ is defined to be the unique monic polynomial satisfying $\deg(g - (\sqrt[d]{g})^d) < \deg g - \deg \sqrt[d]{g}$. Obviously $\deg \sqrt[d]{g} = \deg g/d$.

Let $1 \leq k \leq h$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $g = g(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ be a monic polynomial, $\deg_y g = n/B_k$. Suppose that $(f, g)_0 > n_k \bar{b}_k$. Then $(f, \sqrt[n_k]{g})_0 = \bar{b}_k$.*

The proof of (1.1) is given in Sect. 4 of this paper. We shall follow the methods developed by Abhyankar and Moh in the fundamental paper [2] and simplified by Abhyankar in [1].

Let $1 \leq k \leq h+1$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\phi = \phi(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ be such that $(\phi, x)_0 = n/B_{k-1}$. Then $(f, \phi)_0 \leq \bar{b}_k$ (we put $\bar{b}_{h+1} = +\infty$). If additionally, $(f, \phi)_0 > n_{k-1}\bar{b}_{k-1}$ then ϕ is irreducible and $\Gamma(\phi) = \langle \frac{\bar{b}_0}{B_{k-1}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{b}_{k-1}}{B_{k-1}} \rangle$*

The proof of (1.2) is given in Sect. 5 of this paper. Note that the second part of (1.2) is a generalization of Abhyankar's irreducibility criterion [1, Chapter V].

Lemma 1.3. *Let $g \in \mathcal{O}[y]$ be a monic polynomial of degree $n > 0$ and let $d, e > 0$ be integers such that de divides n . Then $\sqrt[e]{\sqrt[d]{g}} = \sqrt[d]{g}$.*

Proof of (1.3). Let $h = \sqrt[e]{\sqrt[d]{g}}$, so $\deg h = \frac{n}{de}$. We have $\sqrt[d]{g} = (\sqrt[e]{\sqrt[d]{g}})^e + R$, $\deg R < \frac{n}{d} - \frac{n}{de}$ and $g = (\sqrt[d]{g})^d + S$, $\deg S < n - \frac{n}{d}$. Then we get $g = (h^e + R)^d + S = h^{ed} + T$ where $T = \sum_{i=1}^d \binom{d}{i} (h^e)^{d-i} R^i + S$. Since $\deg(\binom{d}{i} (h^e)^{d-i} R^i) < (ed - ei)\frac{n}{de} + i(\frac{n}{d} - \frac{n}{de}) \leq n - \frac{n}{de}$ then $\deg T < n - \frac{n}{de}$. This shows that $h = \sqrt[d]{g}$.

Now, we can prove the Abhyankar–Moh theorem.

Theorem 1.4 [2]. *Let $f = f(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ be an irreducible distinguished polynomial of degree $n > 1$ with $\Gamma(f) = \langle \bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_h \rangle$ and $\bar{b}_0 = (f, x)_0 = n$. Let $1 \leq k \leq h+1$. Then we have*

$$(1.4.1) \quad (f, \sqrt[k]{f})_0 = \bar{b}_k$$

$$(1.4.2) \quad \sqrt[k]{f} \text{ is an irreducible distinguished polynomial of degree } \frac{n}{B_{k-1}} \text{ such that } \Gamma(\sqrt[k]{f}) = \langle \frac{\bar{b}_0}{B_{k-1}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{b}_{k-1}}{B_{k-1}} \rangle.$$

Proof of (1.4). First we check (1.4.1) using (1.1) and induction on k . If $k = h+1$ then $B_{k-1} = B_h$, $\bar{b}_k = \bar{b}_{h+1} = +\infty$ and (1.4.1) is obvious. Let $k \leq h$ and suppose $(f, \sqrt[k]{f})_0 = \bar{b}_{k+1}$ holds true.

The polynomial $\sqrt[k]{f}$ is of degree n/B_k and $(f, \sqrt[k]{f})_0 > n_k \bar{b}_k$ ($\bar{b}_{k+1} > n_k \bar{b}_k$ by (iv)) so we can apply (1.1) to $g = \sqrt[k]{f}$. By (1.1) we get $(f, \sqrt[k]{g})_0 = \bar{b}_k$ and by (1.3) we have $\sqrt[k]{g} = \sqrt[k]{\sqrt[k]{f}} = \sqrt[k]{f}$, consequently $(f, \sqrt[k]{f})_0 = \bar{b}_k$ and (1.4.1) is proved.

In order to prove (1.4.2) put $\phi = \sqrt[k]{f}$. Thus ϕ is a distinguished polynomial of degree n/B_{k-1} , hence $(\phi, x)_0 = n/B_{k-1}$. On the other hand $(f, \phi)_0 = \bar{b}_k > n_{k-1}\bar{b}_{k-1}$ by (1.4.1). According to theorem 1.2 $\phi = \sqrt[k]{f}$ is irreducible and $\Gamma(\phi) = \langle \frac{\bar{b}_0}{B_{k-1}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{b}_{k-1}}{B_{k-1}} \rangle$.

Note. Theorems (1.1) and (1.2) could be formulated and proved for meromorphic curves. However we shall see in the next section that the algebroid case considered by us is sufficient to get important applications of approximate roots.

2. THE ABHYANKAR–MOH INEQUALITY

We give here a geometrical version of the Abhyankar–Moh inequality which is the basic tool for proving the Embedding Theorem [3]. Let $\mathbf{C} \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be an irreducible projective plane curve of degree $n > 1$ and let $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbf{C}$ be its singular point. We assume that $\mathbf{C}$ is analytically irreducible at $\mathbf{O}$ i.e. the analytic germ $(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{O})$ is irreducible, and let $\mathbf{L}$ be the unique tangent to $\mathbf{C}$ at $\mathbf{O}$. Let $\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{O})$ be the semigroup of the branch of $\mathbf{C}$ passing through $\mathbf{O}$ and let $\Gamma(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{O}) = \langle \bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_h \rangle$ with $\bar{b}_0 = (\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{L})_{\mathbf{O}}$.

Theorem 2.1 [3]. *Suppose that $\mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{O}\}$, i.e. $\bar{b}_0 = n$. Then we have $B_{h-1}\bar{b}_h < n^2$.*

Proof. Choose the line at infinity not passing through $\mathbf{O}$ and let x, y be an affine system of coordinates centered at $\mathbf{O}$ such that $\mathbf{L}$ has an equation $x = 0$. Let $f(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ be the irreducible equation of $\mathbf{C}$ in coordinates x, y . It is easy to see that f is a distinguished, irreducible in $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ polynomial and $\Gamma(f) = (\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_h)$.

We have $\deg f = n$ and consequently $\deg {}^{B_h}\sqrt{f} = \frac{n}{B_{h-1}}$, thus (1.4.1) and Bezout's theorem imply $\bar{b}_h = (f, {}^{B_h}\sqrt{f})_0 \leq n \frac{n}{B_{h-1}}$ that is $B_{h-1}\bar{b}_h \leq n^2$. In fact $B_{h-1}\bar{b}_h < n^2$ because the equality $B_{h-1}\bar{b}_h = n^2$ implies $\bar{b}_h = n \frac{n}{B_{h-1}}$ which contradicts the relation $\bar{b}_h \not\equiv 0 \pmod{B_{h-1}}$.

The inequality (2.1) has an application to the polar curves [4].

Theorem 2.2 (with the assumptions as above). *Let $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{O})$ be an irreducible component of the local polar of $\mathbf{C}$ with respect to $\mathbf{L}$.*

Then $(\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{D})_{\mathbf{O}} < (\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{L})_{\mathbf{O}}(\mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{L})_{\mathbf{O}}$.

Proof. In the coordinates x, y introduced in the proof of (2.1) the local polar is given by equation $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} = 0$ and its irreducible component is given by $g = 0$ where g is irreducible (in $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$) divisor of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}$. By the Merle formula for polar invariants [6], [4], [5] and theorem 2.1 we get

$$\frac{(\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{D})_{\mathbf{O}}}{(\mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{L})_{\mathbf{O}}} = \frac{(f, g)_0}{(g, x)_0} = \frac{B_{k-1}\bar{b}_k}{\bar{b}_0} \leq \frac{B_{h-1}\bar{b}_h}{\bar{b}_0} < n = (f, x)_0 = (\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{L})_{\mathbf{O}}$$

and the theorem follows.

3. CHARACTERISTIC, SEMIGROUP OF AN ANALYTIC CURVE AND THE NOETHER FORMULA

In this section we recall some well-known notions of the theory of analytic curves. Our main reference is [10]. Let $f = f(x, y)$ be an irreducible power series y -regular of order $n = \text{ord } f(0, y) > 1$. There exists a power series $y(t) \in \mathbb{C}[[t]]$, $\text{ord } y(t) > 0$ such that $f(t^n, y(t)) = 0$. Moreover every solution of the equation $f(t^n, y) = 0$ is of the form $y(\epsilon t)$ for some ϵ such that $\epsilon^n = 1$. Let $y(t) = \sum a_j t^j$. We put $S(f) = \{j \in \mathbb{N} : a_j \neq 0\}$. Note that $S(f)$ depends only on f .

The characteristic $b_0, b_1, \dots, b_h$ of f is the unique sequence of positive integers satisfying the conditions:

- (i) $b_0 = n$
- (ii) $b_{k+1} = \min\{j \in S(f) : \gcd(b_0, \dots, b_k, j) < \gcd(b_0, \dots, b_k)\}$
- (iii) $\gcd(b_0, \dots, b_h) = 1$

In the sequel we put $B_k = \gcd(b_0, \dots, b_k)$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, h$

and $\bar{b}_k = b_k + \frac{1}{B_{k-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (B_{i-1} - B_i) b_i$ for $k = 1, \dots, h$.

We assume that the sum of an empty family is equal to zero. Thus we have $\bar{b}_1 = b_1$. We put $\bar{b}_0 = b_0$. One checks easily that $\gcd(\bar{b}_0, \dots, \bar{b}_k) = B_k$ for $k = 0, \dots, h$ and $b_k = \bar{b}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\frac{B_{i-1}}{B_i} - 1) \bar{b}_i$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, h$. Therefore the sequence $\bar{b}_0, \dots, \bar{b}_k$ determines sequences $B_0, \dots, B_k$ and $b_0, \dots, b_k$ for any

$k = 0, \dots, h$. We have $\bar{b}_{k+1} - \frac{B_{k-1}}{B_k} \bar{b}_k = b_{k+1} - b_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, h-1$, which shows that the sequence $B_{k-1} \bar{b}_k$ is increasing.

For any k , $1 \leq k \leq h$ we set $S_k = \{j \in S(f) : j < b_{k+1}\}$. We put $b_{h+1} = \bar{b}_{h+1} = +\infty$, so $S_h = S(f)$. Let $y_k(t) = \sum_{j \in S_k} a_j t^j$. There exists an irreducible, monic polynomial $f_k = f_k(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ such that $f_k(t^n, y_k(t)) = 0$.

Lemma 3.1 [10]. $\deg_y f_k(x, y) = n/B_k$, $(f, f_k)_0 = \bar{b}_{k+1}$

Proof. [10, p. 15]

Note that f_{h+1} is the distinguished polynomial associated with f .

Proposition 3.2 [10]. *If $\psi(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$, $\deg_y \psi(x, y) < n/B_k$ and $\psi \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(f)}$, then $(f, \psi)_0 \in \mathbb{N}\bar{b}_0 + \dots + \mathbb{N}\bar{b}_k$*

Proof. [10, p. 16]

Note that from (3.1) and (3.2) we get $\Gamma(f) = \mathbb{N}\bar{b}_0 + \dots + \mathbb{N}\bar{b}_h$. Now, let $g = g(x, y)$ be an irreducible power series y -regular of order $p = \text{ord } f(0, y) < +\infty$. Suppose that f, g are coprime. Let $z(t) \in \mathbb{C}[[t]]$, $\text{ord } z(t) > 0$ be such that $g(t^p, z(t)) = 0$. We put

$$o_f(g) = \max\{\text{ord}(y(\epsilon x^{1/n}) - z(\nu x^{1/p})) : \epsilon^n = 1, \nu^p = 1\}.$$

It is easy to check, that

$$\begin{aligned} o_f(g) &= \max\{\text{ord}(y(x^{1/n}) - z(\nu x^{1/p})) : \nu^p = 1\} \\ &= \max\{\text{ord}(y(\epsilon x^{1/n}) - z(x^{1/p})) : \epsilon^n = 1\} \end{aligned}$$

In particular $o_f(g) = o_g(f)$.

The classical computation leads to the following formula due to Max Noether:

Proposition 3.3 [6], [5]. *Suppose that f, g are irreducible, y -regular power series, f of characteristic $(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_h)$ and let k be the smallest strictly positive integer such that $o_f(g) \leq \frac{b_k}{b_0}$ ($\frac{b_{h+1}}{b_0} = +\infty$). Then*

$$\frac{(f, g)_0}{(g, x)_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (B_{i-1} - B_i) \frac{b_i}{b_0} + B_{k-1} o_f(g)$$

Remark [9]. The Noether formula is really symmetric. Let $(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_m)$ be the characteristic of g . Then $k \leq m$, $\frac{c_i}{c_0} = \frac{b_i}{b_0}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ and $o_f(g) \leq \frac{c_k}{c_0}$. If $C_i = \gcd(c_0, \dots, c_i)$ then the formula can be rewritten in the following form

$$\frac{(f, g)_0}{(f, x)_0} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (C_{i-1} - C_i) \frac{c_i}{c_0} + C_{k-1} o_g(f).$$

Using (3.3) we check easily

Lemma 3.4. *Let $l > 0$ be an integer. Then $o_f(g) \leq \frac{b_l}{b_0}$ iff $\frac{(f, g)_0}{(g, x)_0} \leq B_{l-1} \frac{\bar{b}_l}{b_0}$. Moreover $o_f(g) = \frac{b_l}{b_0}$ is equivalent to $\frac{(f, g)_0}{(g, x)_0} = B_{l-1} \frac{\bar{b}_l}{b_0}$.*

To end with, let us note

Corollary 3.5 to theorem 1.2. *If $f = f(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ is an irreducible distinguished polynomial, then $o_f({}^{B_k}\sqrt{f}) = \frac{b_k}{b_0}$ for $k = 1, \dots, h$.*

Proof. We have $({}^{B_k}\sqrt{f}, x)_0 = \deg_y {}^{B_k}\sqrt{f} = \frac{n}{B_{k-1}}$ and $(f, {}^{B_k}\sqrt{f})_0 = \bar{b}_k$ by (1.4.1). Hence $\frac{(f, {}^{B_k}\sqrt{f})_0}{({}^{B_k}\sqrt{f}, x)_0} = B_{k-1} \frac{\bar{b}_k}{b_0}$. The power series ${}^{B_k}\sqrt{f}$ is irreducible by (1.4.2), thus we get by (3.4) $o_f({}^{B_k}\sqrt{f}) = \frac{b_k}{b_0}$.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Let $g \in \mathcal{O}[y]$ be a monic polynomial with coefficients in the integral domain $\mathcal{O}$ of characteristic zero and let d be a positive divisor of $\deg g$. Given any monic polynomial $h \in \mathcal{O}[y]$ of degree $\deg g/d$ we have h -adic expansion of g , namely

$$g = h^d + a_1 h^{d-1} + \dots + a_d, \quad a_i \in \mathcal{O}[y], \quad \deg a_i < \deg h$$

The polynomials a_i are uniquely determined by g, h . The Tschirnhausen operator $\tau_g(h) = h + \frac{1}{d}a_1$ changes h to $\tau_g(h)$ which is again monic of degree $\deg g/d$.

Lemma 4.1 [1]. $\sqrt[d]{g} = \tau_g(\tau_g \dots (\tau_g(h)) \dots)$ with τ_g repeated $\deg g/d$ times.

Proof [1, p. 16].

To prove (1.1) it suffices to check the following

(*) if $h(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ is a monic polynomial of degree n/B_{k-1} such that $(f, h)_0 = \bar{b}_k$, then $(f, \tau_g(h))_0 = \bar{b}_k$.

Indeed, to get the relation $(f, \sqrt[n]{g})_0 = \bar{b}_k$ we take $h = f_{k-1}$ (cf. lemma 3.1) and apply Tschirnhausen operator τ_g to h $\deg g/n_k = n/B_{k-1}$ times.

To prove (*) fix a monic polynomial $h(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x]][y]$ such that $\deg h = n/B_{k-1}$ and $(f, h)_0 = \bar{b}_k$ and let us consider the h -adic expansion of g :

$$(1) \quad g = h^{n_k} + a_1 h^{n_k-1} + \dots + a_{n_k}, \quad \deg_y a_i < \deg_y h = n/B_{k-1}$$

Let I be the set of all $i \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$ such that $a_i \neq 0$. Therefore $(f, a_i)_0 < +\infty$ for $i \in I$ and by Proposition 3.2 we have $(f, a_i)_0 \in \mathbb{N}\bar{b}_0 + \dots + \mathbb{N}\bar{b}_{k-1}$ hence $(f, a_i)_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{B_{k-1}}$ for $i \in I$.

We have

$$(2) \quad (f, a_i h^{n_k-i})_0 \neq (f, a_j h^{n_k-j})_0 \quad \text{for } i \neq j \in I$$

Suppose that (2) is not true, So there exist $i, j \in I$ such that $i < j$ and $(f, a_i h^{n_k-i})_0 = (f, a_j h^{n_k-j})_0$. Therefore $(f, a_i)_0 + (n_k - i)\bar{b}_k = (f, a_j)_0 + (n_k - j)\bar{b}_k$ and $(j - i)\bar{b}_k = (f, a_j)_0 - (f, a_i)_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{B_{k-1}}$. The last relation implies $(j - i)\frac{\bar{b}_k}{B_k} \equiv 0 \pmod{n_k}$ and consequently $j - i \equiv 0 \pmod{n_k}$ because $\bar{b}_k/B_k$ and n_k are coprime. We get a contradiction because $0 < j - i < n_k$.

From (1) and (2) we have

$$(3) \quad (f, g - h^{n_k})_0 = \min_{i=1}^{n_k} (f, a_i h^{n_k-i})_0$$

By assumption $(f, g)_0 > n_k \bar{b}_k = (f, h^{n_k})_0$, so $(f, g - h^{n_k})_0 = n_k \bar{b}_k$ and (3) implies $n_k \bar{b}_k \leq (f, a_i h^{n_k-i})_0 = (f, a_i)_0 + (n_k - i)\bar{b}_k$ for $i = 1, \dots, n_k$. Therefore we get

$$(4) \quad (f, a_i)_0 \geq i \bar{b}_k \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n_k$$

Moreover we have

$$(5) \quad \text{if } (f, a_i)_0 = i\bar{b}_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n_k \quad \text{then } i = n_k.$$

Indeed, from $(f, a_i)_0 = i\bar{b}_k$ it follows that $i\bar{b}_k \equiv 0 \pmod{B_{k-1}}$ and $i\frac{\bar{b}_k}{B_k} \equiv 0 \pmod{n_k}$, so $i \equiv 0 \pmod{n_k}$ because $\bar{b}_k/B_k, n_k$ are coprime. Hence we get $i = n_k$.

By (5) we get (because $n_k > 1$)

$$(6) \quad (f, a_1)_0 > b_k$$

$$\text{Therefore } (f, \tau_g(h))_0 = (f, h + \frac{1}{n_k}a_1)_0 = (f, h)_0 = \bar{b}_k.$$

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

The proof of (1.2) is based on the following

Lemma 5.1. *Let $g = g(x, y)$ be an irreducible power series, $p = (g, x)_0 < +\infty$ and let $1 < k \leq h+1$. If $\frac{(f, g)_0}{(g, x)_0} > \frac{B_{k-2}\bar{b}_{k-1}}{b_0}$, then $(g, x)_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{\frac{b_0}{B_{k-1}}}$. If, additionally $(g, x)_0 = \frac{b_0}{B_{k-1}}$, then $\Gamma(f) = \langle \frac{\bar{b}_1}{B_{k-1}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{b}_{k-1}}{B_{k-1}} \rangle$.*

Proof of 5.1. Let $(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_m)$, $c_0 = p$ be the characteristic of g . By lemma 3.4 we have $o_f(g) > \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_0}$, so there exist Puiseux expansions determined by $f(x, y) = 0$ and $g(x, y) = 0$ respectively which coincide up to the ‘monomials’ of degree $\frac{b_{k-1}}{n}$. Therefore $k-1 \leq m$ and $\frac{b_1}{n} = \frac{c_1}{p}, \dots, \frac{b_{k-1}}{n} = \frac{c_{k-1}}{p}$. There exist integers $a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}$ such that $B_{k-1} = a_0b_0 + a_1b_1 + \dots + a_{k-1}b_{k-1}$, consequently we get $pB_{k-1} = (a_0p)n + a_1(nc_1) + \dots + a_{k-1}(nc_{k-1}) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ and $p \equiv 0 \pmod{\frac{n}{B_{k-1}}}$ which proves the first part of (5.1).

Suppose now that $p = \frac{n}{B_{k-1}}$. We have $c_i = \frac{p}{n}b_i = \frac{b_i}{B_{k-1}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, hence $\Gamma(f) = \langle \frac{\bar{b}_1}{B_{k-1}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{b}_{k-1}}{B_{k-1}} \rangle$.

Now, we can pass to the proof of (1.2).

Let $\phi = \phi(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$ be y -regular, $(\phi, x)_0 = \frac{n}{B_{k-1}}$. We shall check that $(f, \phi)_0 \leq \bar{b}_k$. If $k = h+1$ it is obvious ($\bar{b}_{h+1} = +\infty$), so we assume $k \leq h$. Write

$$\phi = g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_s, \quad g_j \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]] \text{ irreducible}$$

We have

$$(1) \quad \frac{(f, g_j)_0}{(g_j, x)_0} \leq \frac{B_{k-1}\bar{b}_k}{n} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s$$

Indeed, if we had $\frac{(f, g_j)_0}{(g_j, x)_0} > \frac{B_{k-1}\bar{b}_k}{n}$ for some j then, by lemma 5.1 we would get $(g_j, x)_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{\frac{n}{B_k}}$ and consequently $(g_j, x)_0 \geq \frac{n}{B_k}$. It is impossible, because $(g_j, x)_0 \leq (\phi, x)_0 = \frac{n}{B_{k-1}}$.

Now, from (1) we get

$$(f, \phi)_0 = \sum_j (f, g_j)_0 \leq \sum_j \frac{B_{k-1}\bar{b}_k}{n} (g_j, x)_0 = \frac{B_{k-1}\bar{b}_k}{n} (\phi, x)_0 = \bar{b}_k$$

Having proved the first part of (1.2) let us assume that $(f, \phi)_0 > n_{k-1} \bar{b}_{k-1}$. We claim that there exists a $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that

$$(2) \quad \frac{(f, g_j)_0}{(g_j, x)_0} > \frac{B_{k-2} \bar{b}_{k-1}}{n}$$

Suppose, contrary to our claim, that $\frac{(f, g_j)_0}{(g_j, x)_0} \leq \frac{B_{k-2} \bar{b}_{k-1}}{n}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Thus we would have

$$(f, \phi)_0 = \sum_j (f, g_j)_0 \leq \frac{B_{k-2} \bar{b}_{k-1}}{n} \sum_j (g_j, x)_0 = \frac{B_{k-2} \bar{b}_{k-1}}{n} (\phi, x)_0 = n_{k-1} \bar{b}_{k-1}$$

which contradicts our assumption.

From (2) it follows, by lemma 5.1, that $(g_j, x)_0 = q \frac{n}{B_{k-1}}$ for some integer $q \geq 1$. On the other hand $(g_j, x)_0 \leq (\phi, x)_0 = \frac{n}{B_{k-1}}$. Therefore we get $q = 1$ and $(g_j, x)_0 = (\phi, x)_0$. Recall that g_j divides ϕ , g_j is irreducible and $\text{ord } g_j(0, y) = \text{ord } \phi(0, y)$, thus g_j is associated to ϕ which proves irreducibility of ϕ .

REFERENCES

- [1] S. S. Abhhyankar, *Expansion Techniques in Algebraic Geometry*, Tata Inst. Found. Research, Bombay, 1977.
- [2] S. S. Abhhyankar, T. Moh, *Newton-Puiseux expansion and generalized Tschirnhausen transformation*, J. reine. angew. Math. **260** (1973), 47–83; **261** (1973), 29–54.
- [3] ———, *Embeddings of the line in the plane*, ibid. **276** (1975), 148–166.
- [4] R. Ephraïm, *Special Polares and Curves with one Place at Infinity*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **40** (1985), 353–359, Part I.
- [5] J. Gwoździejewicz and A. Płoski, *On the Merle formula for polar invariants*, Bull. Soc. Sci. Letters XLI, **7** (1991), Łódź, 61–67.
- [6] M. Merle, *Invariants polaires des courbes planes*, Invent. Math. **41** (1977), 103–111.
- [7] T. T. Moh, *On the concept of approximate roots for algebra*, J. of Algebra **65** (1980), 347–360.
- [8] ———, *On two fundamental theorems for the concept of approximate roots*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **34**, no. 4 (1982).
- [9] A. Płoski, *Bezout's theorem for affine curves with one branch at infinity*, Univ. Iaq. Acta Math. **Math. Fasc 28** (1991), 77–80.
- [10] O. Zariski, *Le problème des modules pour les branches planes*, Centre de Mathématiques de l'Ecole Polytechnique, 1973.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS,
TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY,
AL. 1000 LPP 7, 25–314 KIELCE,
POLAND

E-mail address: mat-jg@srv1.tu.kielce.pl